UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/746,650	12/26/2000	Abdi R. Modarressi	BS97-052	9924

28970 7590 07/13/2004

SHAW PITTMAN
IP GROUP
1650 TYSONS BOULEVARD
SUITE 1300
MCLEAN, VA 22102

EXAMINER	
SCHEIBEL, ROBERT C	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2666	7

DATE MAILED: 07/13/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/746,650	MODARRESSI ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Robert C. Scheibel	2666	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *12/26/2000*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-49* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-49* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *26 December 2000* is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☒ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 5.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

1. The drawings are objected to because:

- The outputs of decision block 414 of Figure 4 are labeled incorrectly; the output to block 412 (currently "Yes") should be labeled "No" and the output to block 416 (currently "No") should be labeled "Yes".
- The word "as" in block 520 of Figure 5 should be "an".

Corrected drawing sheets are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled "Replacement Sheet" in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.84(c)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the drawing figures. If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Specification

2. The lengthy specification has not been checked to the extent necessary to determine the presence of all possible minor errors. Applicant's cooperation is requested in correcting any errors of which applicant may become aware in the specification.

3. The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. See 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01(o). Correction of the following is required:

The limitation of claims 27 and 41 of the second trigger activating the first trigger is not supported in the specification. The passage from line 13 of page 18 through line 16 of page 20 discusses the use of a first and second trigger and is the most logical place for this support to be included; however, this passage does not discuss one of the triggers being used to activate the other trigger.

Claim Objections

4. Claims **27 and 41** are objected to because of the following informalities:

The phrase "the first trigger" refers back to the originally stated "a trigger" in the parent claims (claims 21 and 37). Examiner understands that these are the same triggers, but for clarity, the phrase "a trigger" in the parent claims should be changed to "a first trigger". Note that this also requires the phrase "the trigger" in other claims

dependent upon claims 27 and 41 (claim 45, for example) to be changed to match the wording in the corresponding parent claim.

5. Claims **33** is objected to because of the following informalities:

The phrase "a computer" should be changed to "the computer" if this is intended to refer to the same computer recited in the parent claim (31). If this is intended to be a separate computer, the 2 computers should be distinguished more clearly in the claim language.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

6. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

7. Claims **31-36 and 48-49** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim **31** recites the limitation "the computer" in line 18 (line 10 of page 35). There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. For the purpose of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) below, it is assumed that the essence of this limitation is that the gateway communicate with the database (over the computer network) to receive routing instructions. Claims **32-36** are rejected as being dependent on indefinite claim 31.

Claims **48 and 49** recites the limitation "the database" in line 1. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

10. Claims **1-4, 6-9, 11-14, 17-26, and 37-40** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,366,661 to Devillier et al in view of U.S. Patent 6,212,261 to Meubus et al.

Regarding claims **1 and 21**, Devillier discloses the service switching point in the SSP 22 of Figure 2 (described as an SSP in lines 24-32 of column 4). Devillier discloses the service control point in the AIN SCP 32 of Figure 2. Devillier discloses the

gateway in the server 16 of Figure 2. The limitation of the service switching point launching a query to the service control point is disclosed in the first block of Figure 5A (the SCP receiving the message to request subscriber status); also see lines 11-17 of column 6 for more information. The limitation of the service control point sending a call processing request to the gateway when it receives the query is disclosed in the query transmitted to the server (see second block of Figure 5A). The limitation that the gateway communicates with the computer network to obtain a response to process the call is disclosed in lines 40-51 of column 6 (which describes how the SCP passes the caller identification information to the gateway (server)) and in lines 35-65 of column 7 (which describes how the gateway (communications server) sends a request to the subscriber's PC to request instructions on how to route the call (from the subscriber). The limitation of the service control point processing the incoming call in accordance with the response is disclosed in lines 1-3 of column 7 (with more detail in the lines following this passage).

Similarly, regarding claims **11 and 37**, Devillier discloses the step of detecting an incoming call at the service switching point in lines 11-17 of column 6. The step of launching a query to the service control point is disclosed in the first block of Figure 5A (the SCP receiving the message to request subscriber status); also see lines 11-17 of column 6 for more information. The step of sending a call processing request to the gateway is disclosed in the query transmitted to the server (see second block of Figure 5A). The step of sending the call processing request to the network (claim 11) or subscriber (claim 37) is disclosed in lines 40-51 of column 6 (which describes how the

SCP passes the caller identification information to the gateway (server)) and in lines 35-65 of column 7 (which describes how the gateway (communications server) sends a request to the subscriber's PC to request instructions on how to route the call (from the subscriber). The step of obtaining a response for processing the call from the network computer network (claim 11) or formulating a response to the query (claim 37) is disclosed in lines 62-65 of column 7. The step of processing (claim 11) or completing (claim 37) the incoming call in accordance with the response is disclosed in lines 1-3 of column 7 (with more detail in the lines following this passage).

Devillier does not disclose expressly the limitation that a trigger is used in the SSP or the step of provisioning a trigger on the telephone line at the service switching point as specified in the claims.

However, it is well known that in AIN networks (like that of Devillier, triggers are the means by which the special call processing is handled in the SSP/SCP). Meubus discloses the limitation of provisioning an SSP with a trigger and in launching a query from the SSP to the SCP when an incoming call is detected by that trigger in the Termination_Attempt trigger described throughout (for example in lines 51-61 of column 6.) In this case, the PSTN-G is the service control point as indicated in lines 43-47 of column 6. While the provisioning of the trigger is not explicitly mentioned in this passage, it is implicit to one of ordinary skill in the art in that the trigger must be provisioned prior to being used as described in the above cited passage.

Devillier and Meubus are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of call processing in advanced intelligent networks. These two references are

in fact directed in part to the same problem the applicant is solving which is notification of incoming calls to users with an online connection (via that online connection).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to implement the SSP of Devillier using the Termination_Attempt trigger and related signaling described in Meubus.

The motivation for doing so would be to comply with well-know industry standards so that the SSP and SCP could be from separate vendors, thus providing a more flexible network architecture.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Meubus with Devillier for the benefit of providing a flexible network architecture to obtain the invention as specified in claims 1, 11, 21, and 37.

Regarding claim **2**, Devillier discloses the limitation of the SCP, gateway, and computer network using a TCP/IP interface in Figure 2 which shows the computer network connecting the SCP and the gateway as the "Internet" which is well known to use the TCP/IP protocol.

Regarding claims **3**, Meubus discloses the limitation that the trigger is a termination attempt trigger in the same passage (lines 51-61 of column 6) cited in the rejection of claim 1 above. The trigger referred to in the above rejection is a Termination Attempt trigger as indicated in the rejection. Devillier and Meubus are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of call processing in advanced intelligent networks. These two references are in fact directed in part to the

same problem the applicant is solving which is notification of incoming calls to users with an online connection (via that online connection).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to implement the SSP of Devillier using the Termination_Attempt trigger and related signaling described in Meubus.

The motivation for doing so would be to comply with well-know industry standards so that the SSP and SCP could be from separate vendors, thus providing a more flexible network architecture.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Meubus with Devillier for the benefit of providing a flexible network architecture to obtain the invention as specified in claim 3.

Regarding claims **4 and 13**, Devillier discloses the limitation that the call processing request comprises an identity of the calling party in lines 40-45 of column 6 as well as in lines 54-55 of column 7 which describes how caller identification information is retrieved from the LIDB database to be transmitted to the gateway (communications server) in the request. The limitation of the request including a plurality of call routing options is disclosed in lines 58-62 of column 7.

Regarding claims **6, 22, and 38**, Devillier discloses the limitation that the telephone line is being used by a called party to maintain a communication session with the computer network in lines 3-8 of the abstract.

Regarding claim **7**, Devillier discloses the limitation of obtaining a response from the called party in lines 62-65 of column 7.

Regarding claim **8**, Devillier discloses that the response selected by the subscriber is transmitted via the subscriber's computer (PC) in lines 51-58 of column 7. This passage indicates that software on the subscriber's PC is used to interact with the subscriber, thus disclosing the limitation of claim 8.

Regarding claim **9**, Devillier discloses the limitation of the telephone line belonging to a party who maintains a communication session with the computer network using a dedicated communication link in the embodiment of Figure 7. As described in the passage from line 66 of column 7 through line 31 of column 8, this embodiment notifies a user of a call to his/her home telephone number via an Internet session to his/her work computer. In this case the dedicated communication link is the link from the work computer to the Internet.

Regarding claim **12**, Devillier discloses the limitation of contacting the called party over the computer network in lines 49-65 of column 7.

Regarding claim **14**, Devillier discloses the limitation of selecting one of the plurality of call routing options throughout, for example in lines 62-65 of column 7.

Regarding claims **17 and 18**, Devillier discloses the limitations of accessing a computer of the called party via the computer network and obtaining a response from the computer in lines 51-58 o f column 7.

Regarding claims **19 and 20**, Devillier discloses the limitation of processing the incoming call with default treatment if a response is not received and the limitation of the default treatment being to terminate the call to the party's voice mailbox in lines 63-67 of column 6.

Regarding claim **23**, Devillier discloses the limitation that the subscriber uses a communication link to establish the session between the computer and the computer network in lines 3-5 of the abstract.

Regarding claims **24 and 39**, the limitation that the communication link is a second telephone line is disclosed in Devillier in the embodiment of Figure 7. In this embodiment, the communication link is the connection from the subscriber's work computer to the Internet; it is well known that this connection can be via a dial-up service and thus is a second telephone line (either the line to the subscriber's home phone or the line to the subscriber's work phone being the first.)

Regarding claims **25 and 40**, Devillier discloses the limitation that the communication link is one of an ISDN line, a DSL, a T1 line and as T3 line in the embodiment of Figure 7. In this embodiment, the communication link is the connection from the subscriber's work computer to the Internet. It is well known in the art that this connection can be any one of the types listed in claims 25 and 40.

Regarding claim **26**, Devillier discloses the limitation that the response comprises an instruction to end the communication session and terminate (connect) the incoming call to the line in lines 49-52 of column 5.

11. Claims **47 and 49** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,366,661 to Devillier et al in view of U.S. Patent 6,212,261 to Meubus et al as applied to claim 47 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent 5,917,817 to Dunn et al.

Devillier, modified, discloses all the limitations of claim 37 as indicated in the rejection above. However, Devillier does not disclose expressly the limitation of the call routing instructions being maintained by the subscriber or the limitation of the database being accessible to the subscriber.

Dunn discloses throughout the document a method of allowing subscribers to access a database to modify the service provided to them. Specifically, the database is the customer feature database 18 of figures 5 and 6. The access is described in lines 41-60 of column 5. This access discloses the limitation that the database is accessible to the subscriber and thus also discloses the limitation that the subscriber maintains the call routing instructions since modifications to this database affect how calls to that subscriber are handled. Devillier, modified, and Dunn are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of call processing in advanced intelligent networks. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify Devillier, modified, to allow subscribers to modify the contents of the Internet database. The motivation for doing so would have been to provide a cost-effective and simple method for enabling customers to control services at any time as suggested by Dunn in lines 66 of column 1 through line 5 of column 2. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Dunn with Devillier, modified, for the benefit of allowing subscribers to control services to obtain the invention as specified in claims 47 and 49.

12. Claims **5, 10, 15-16, 46, and 48** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,366,661 to Devillier et al in view of U.S. Patent 6,212,261 to Meubus et al and in further view of U.S. Patent 6,014,379 to White et al.

Regarding claims **5, 10, 15-16, 46, and 48**, all the limitations of the parent claims (1, 11, and 37) are disclosed by the combination of Devillier and Meubus as described in the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) above. However, the combination of Devillier and Meubus does not disclose expressly the limitation of a database accessible via the computer network, the accessing of this database, or the association of the database with the computer. White discloses the limitation of a database associated with the computer network (claims 5, 10, 15-16, 46, and 48), wherein the database contains call routing instructions in the database 35 of Figure 1. The paragraph from lines 16-34 of column 12 describes how the database is used to store routing instructions (claim 46). The limitations of accessing the database via the computer network and obtaining a response from the database (claims 15 and 16) are disclosed in lines 1-16 of column 13. White discloses the limitation of the database being associated with the computer (claim 48) in lines 51-57 of column 14. This passage indicates the association of the database with the computer (PC) through the Internet address fields.

Devillier and White are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of call processing in telecommunications networks. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify Devillier to store call routing instructions in a database on the Internet. The motivation for doing so would have been to greater universality of custom subscriber services as

suggested by White in lines 43-45 of column 6. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine White with Devillier for the benefit of greater universality of custom services to obtain the invention as specified in claims 5, 10, 15-16, 46 and 48.

13. Claims **1-4, 6-9, 11-14, 17-28, 30, 37-42 and 44-45** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,366,661 to Devillier et al in view of U.S. Patent 6,144,644 to Bajzath et al.

Regarding claims **1 and 21**, Devillier discloses the service switching point in the SSP 22 of Figure 2 (described as an SSP in lines 24-32 of column 4). Devillier discloses the service control point in the AIN SCP 32 of Figure 2. Devillier discloses the gateway in the server 16 of Figure 2. The limitation of the service switching point launching a query to the service control point is disclosed in the first block of Figure 5A (the SCP receiving the message to request subscriber status); also see lines 11-17 of column 6 for more information. The limitation of the service control point sending a call processing request to the gateway when it receives the query is disclosed in the query transmitted to the server (see second block of Figure 5A). The limitation that the gateway communicates with the computer network to obtain a response to process the call is disclosed in lines 40-51 of column 6 (which describes how the SCP passes the caller identification information to the gateway (server)) and in lines 35-65 of column 7 (which describes how the gateway (communications server) sends a request to the subscriber's PC to request instructions on how to route the call (from the subscriber). The limitation of the service control point processing the incoming call in accordance

with the response is disclosed in lines 1-3 of column 7 (with more detail in the lines following this passage).

Similarly, regarding claims **11 and 37**, Devillier discloses the step of detecting an incoming call at the service switching point in lines 11-17 of column 6. The step of launching a query to the service control point is disclosed in the first block of Figure 5A (the SCP receiving the message to request subscriber status); also see lines 11-17 of column 6 for more information. The step of sending a call processing request to the gateway is disclosed in the query transmitted to the server (see second block of Figure 5A). The step of sending the call processing request to the network (claim 11) or subscriber (claim 37) is disclosed in lines 40-51 of column 6 (which describes how the SCP passes the caller identification information to the gateway (server)) and in lines 35-65 of column 7 (which describes how the gateway (communications server) sends a request to the subscriber's PC to request instructions on how to route the call (from the subscriber). The step of obtaining a response for processing the call from the network computer network (claim 11) or formulating a response to the query (claim 37) is disclosed in lines 62-65 of column 7. The step of processing (claim 11) or completing (claim 37) the incoming call in accordance with the response is disclosed in lines 1-3 of column 7 (with more detail in the lines following this passage).

Devillier does not disclose expressly the limitation that a trigger is used in the SSP or the step of provisioning a trigger on the telephone line at the service switching point as specified in the claims.

However, it is well known that in AIN networks (like that of Devillier, triggers are the means by which the special call processing is handled in the SSP/SCP). Bajzath discloses the limitation of provisioning an SSP with a trigger (lines 64-67 of column 4) and in launching a query from the SSP to the SCP when an incoming call is detected by that trigger (lines 9-12 of column 6).

Devillier and Bajzath are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of call processing in advanced intelligent networks. These two references are in fact directed in part to the same problem the applicant is solving which is notification of incoming calls to users with an online connection (via that online connection).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to implement the SSP of Devillier using the Termination_Attempt trigger and related signaling described in Bajzath.

The motivation for doing so would be to comply with well-know industry standards so that the SSP and SCP could be from separate vendors, thus providing a more flexible network architecture.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Bajzath with Devillier for the benefit of providing a flexible network architecture to obtain the invention as specified in claims 1, 11, 21, and 37.

Regarding claim **2**, Devillier discloses the limitation of the SCP, gateway, and computer network using a TCP/IP interface in Figure 2 which shows the computer network connecting the SCP and the gateway as the "Internet" which is well known to use the TCP/IP protocol.

Regarding claims **3**, Bajzath discloses the limitation that the trigger is a termination attempt trigger in the same passage (lines 64-67 of column 4) cited in the rejection of claim 1 above. The trigger referred to in the above rejection is a Termination Attempt trigger. Devillier and Bajzath are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of call processing in advanced intelligent networks. These two references are in fact directed in part to the same problem the applicant is solving which is notification of incoming calls to users with an online connection (via that online connection).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to implement the SSP of Devillier using the Termination_Attempt trigger and related signaling described in Bajzath.

The motivation for doing so would be to comply with well-know industry standards so that the SSP and SCP could be from separate vendors, thus providing a more flexible network architecture.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Bajzath with Devillier for the benefit of providing a flexible network architecture to obtain the invention as specified in claim 3.

Regarding claims **4 and 13**, Devillier discloses the limitation that the call processing request comprises an identity of the calling party in lines 40-45 of column 6 as well as in lines 54-55 of column 7 which describes how caller identification information is retrieved from the LIDB database to be transmitted to the gateway

(communications server) in the request. The limitation of the request including a plurality of call routing options is disclosed in lines 58-62 of column 7.

Regarding claims **6, 22, and 38**, Devillier discloses the limitation that the telephone line is being used by a called party to maintain a communication session with the computer network in lines 3-8 of the abstract.

Regarding claim **7**, Devillier discloses the limitation of obtaining a response from the called party in lines 62-65 of column 7.

Regarding claim **8**, Devillier discloses that the response selected by the subscriber is transmitted via the subscriber's computer (PC) in lines 51-58 of column 7. This passage indicates that software on the subscriber's PC is used to interact with the subscriber, thus disclosing the limitation of claim 8.

Regarding claim **9**, Devillier discloses the limitation of the telephone line belonging to a party who maintains a communication session with the computer network using a dedicated communication link in the embodiment of Figure 7. As described in the passage from line 66 of column 7 through line 31 of column 8, this embodiment notifies a user of a call to his/her home telephone number via an Internet session to his/her work computer. In this case the dedicated communication link is the link from the work computer to the Internet.

Regarding claim **12**, Devillier discloses the limitation of contacting the called party over the computer network in lines 49-65 of column 7.

Regarding claim **14**, Devillier discloses the limitation of selecting one of the plurality of call routing options throughout, for example in lines 62-65 of column 7.

Regarding claims **17 and 18**, Devillier discloses the limitations of accessing a computer of the called party via the computer network and obtaining a response from the computer in lines 51-58 o f column 7.

Regarding claims **19 and 20**, Devillier discloses the limitation of processing the incoming call with default treatment if a response is not received and the limitation of the default treatment being to terminate the call to the party's voice mailbox in lines 63-67 of column 6.

Regarding claim **23**, Devillier discloses the limitation that the subscriber uses a communication link to establish the session between the computer and the computer network in lines 3-5 of the abstract.

Regarding claims **24 and 39**, the limitation that the communication link is a second telephone line is disclosed in Devillier in the embodiment of Figure 7. In this embodiment, the communication link is the connection from the subscriber's work computer to the Internet; it is well known that this connection can be via a dial-up service and thus is a second telephone line (either the line to the subscriber's home phone or the line to the subscriber's work phone being the first.)

Regarding claims **25 and 40**, Devillier discloses the limitation that the communication link is one of an ISDN line, a DSL, a T1 line and as T3 line in the embodiment of Figure 7. In this embodiment, the communication link is the connection from the subscriber's work computer to the Internet. It is well known in the art that this connection can be any one of the types listed in claims 25 and 40.

Regarding claim **26**, Devillier discloses the limitation that the response comprises an instruction to end the communication session and terminate (connect) the incoming call to the line in lines 49-52 of column 5.

Regarding claims **27-28, 30, 41-42, and 44-45**, Devillier does not disclose expressly the limitations of a first and second trigger and the relationship between these triggers described in these claims.

However, Bajzath discloses the limitations of these claims. Regarding claims **27 and 41**, Bajzath discloses the limitation of a second trigger implicitly in lines 41-45 of column 4. When the user dials the ISPs telephone number, it triggers the information signal to be routed to the SCP. This in turn causes the termination attempt trigger to be activated as seen in the passage from lines 45-67 of column 4 (disclosing the limitation of the second trigger activating the first trigger. Regarding claims **28 and 42**, Bajzath discloses the limitation that the first trigger is a termination attempt trigger in lines 64-67 of column 4. Regarding claims **30 and 44**, Bajzath discloses the limitation that the second trigger is associated with the establishment of the communication between the computer and the computer network in lines 41-45 of column 4; the establishment of this communication is initiated by dialing the ISPs telephone number. Regarding claim **45**, Bajzath discloses (lines 41-67 of column 4) the limitation of the trigger (the first trigger in this case) being activated when a communication session is established between the computer and the computer network.

Devillier and Bajzath are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of call processing in advanced intelligent networks. These two references are

in fact directed in part to the same problem the applicant is solving which is notification of incoming calls to users with an online connection (via that online connection).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify Devillier to trigger processing based on the dialing of the ISPs number and activate the TAT trigger based on this ISP number dialing.

The motivation for doing so would be to allow more flexibility by allowing the call waiting and call control method to be performed whether the user was connected to the Internet or to a non-Internet party as specified by Bajzath in the last sentence of the abstract and lines 1-7 of column 8.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Bajzath with Devillier for the benefit of providing a flexible network architecture to obtain the invention as specified in claims 27-28, 30, 41-42, and 44-45.

14. Claims **47 and 49** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,366,661 to Devillier et al in view of U.S. Patent 6,144,644 to Bajzath et al as applied to claim 47 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent 5,917,817 to Dunn et al.

Devillier, modified, discloses all the limitations of claim 37 as indicated in the rejection above. However, Devillier does not disclose expressly the limitation of the call routing instructions being maintained by the subscriber or the limitation of the database being accessible to the subscriber.

Dunn discloses throughout the document a method of allowing subscribers to access a database to modify the service provided to them. Specifically, the database is the customer feature database 18 of figures 5 and 6. The access is described in lines 41-60 of column 5. This access discloses the limitation that the database is accessible to the subscriber and thus also discloses the limitation that the subscriber maintains the call routing instructions since modifications to this database affect how calls to that subscriber are handled. Devillier, modified, and Dunn are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of call processing in advanced intelligent networks. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify Devillier, modified, to allow subscribers to modify the contents of the Internet database. The motivation for doing so would have been to provide a cost-effective and simple method for enabling customers to control services at any time as suggested by Dunn in lines 66 of column 1 through line 5 of column 2. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Dunn with Devillier, modified, for the benefit of allowing subscribers to control services to obtain the invention as specified in claims 47 and 49.

15. Claims **5, 10, 15-16, 46, and 48** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,366,661 to Devillier et al in view of U.S. Patent 6,144,644 to Bajzath et al and in further view of U.S. Patent 6,014,379 to White et al.

Regarding claims **5, 10, 15-16, 46, and 48**, all the limitations of the parent claims (1, 11, and 37) are disclosed by the combination of Devillier and Meubus as described

in the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) above. However, the combination of Devillier and Meubus does not disclose expressly the limitation of a database accessible via the computer network, the accessing of this database, or the association of the database with the computer. White discloses the limitation of a database associated with the computer network (claims 5, 10, 15-16, 46, and 48), wherein the database contains call routing instructions in the database 35 of Figure 1. The paragraph from lines 16-34 of column 12 describes how the database is used to store routing instructions (claim 46). The limitations of accessing the database via the computer network and obtaining a response from the database (claims 15 and 16) are disclosed in lines 1-16 of column 13. White discloses the limitation of the database being associated with the computer (claim 48) in lines 51-57 of column 14. This passage indicates the association of the database with the computer (PC) through the Internet address fields.

Devillier and White are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of call processing in telecommunications networks. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify Devillier to store call routing instructions in a database on the Internet. The motivation for doing so would have been to greater universality of custom subscriber services as suggested by White in lines 43-45 of column 6. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine White with Devillier for the benefit of greater universality of custom services to obtain the invention as specified in claims 5, 10, 15-16, 46 and 48.

16. Claims **29 and 43** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,366,661 to Devillier et al in view of U.S. Patent 6,144,644 to Bajzath et al as applied to claims 27 and 41 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent 5,974,133 to Fleischer et al.

The combination of Devillier and Bajzath discloses all the limitations of parent claims 27 and 41 as indicated in the rejection above. However, Devillier, as modified, does not disclose expressly the limitation of the second trigger being one of a public office dialing plan trigger and a customized dialing plan trigger. Fleischer discloses the use of a Customized Dialing Plan trigger in the passage from line 52 of column 20 through line 27 of column 21. Devillier, modified, and Fleischer are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of call processing in advanced intelligent networks. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use a CDP trigger to indicate to the SSP when the customer is calling the ISP. The motivation for doing so would have been to provide increased flexibility to an existing private network system as suggested by Fleischer in lines 3-9 of the abstract. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Fleischer with Devillier, modified, for the benefit of increased flexibility to obtain the invention as specified in claims 29 and 43.

17. Claim **31, 33 and 34** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,366,661 to Devillier et al in view of U.S. Patent 6,014,379 to White et al.

Devillier discloses the service switching point in the SSP 22 of Figure 2 (described as an SSP in lines 24-32 of column 4). Devillier discloses the service control point in the AIN SCP 32 of Figure 2. Devillier discloses the gateway in the server 16 of Figure 2. The limitation of the service switching point launching a query to the service control point is disclosed in the first block of Figure 5A (the SCP receiving the message to request subscriber status); also see lines 11-17 of column 6 for more information. The limitation of the service control point sending a call processing request to the gateway when it receives the query is disclosed in the query transmitted to the server (see second block of Figure 5A). The limitation that the gateway communicates with the computer network to obtain a response to process the call is disclosed in lines 40-51 of column 6 (which describes how the SCP passes the caller identification information to the gateway (server)) and in lines 35-65 of column 7 (which describes how the gateway (communications server) sends a request to the subscriber's PC to request instructions on how to route the call (from the subscriber). The limitation of the service control point processing the incoming call in accordance with the response is disclosed in lines 1-3 of column 7.

Devillier does not disclose expressly the limitations of the service switching point comprising a trigger provisioned for the telephone line, the incoming call being detected by the trigger, the database, or the gateway communicating with the network to obtain a response from the database.

White discloses the limitation of the service switching point comprising a trigger provisioned for the telephone line in lines 48-53 of column 8. This passage also

discloses the limitation of using the trigger to detect the incoming call, prompting a query for call processing instructions. White discloses the limitation of a database associated with the computer network, wherein the database contains call routing instructions in the database 35 of Figure 1. The paragraph from lines 16-34 of column 12 describes how the database is used to store routing instructions. The limitations of the gateway obtaining a response from the database and the response containing information from the database are disclosed in lines 1-16 of column 13.

Devillier and White are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of call processing in telecommunications networks. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify Devillier to store call routing instructions in a database on the Internet.

The motivation for doing so would have been to greater universality of custom subscriber services as suggested by White in lines 43-45 of column 6.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine White with Devillier for the benefit of greater universality of custom services to obtain the invention as specified in claim 31.

Regarding claim **33**, Devillier discloses the limitation that the subscriber uses a computer to establish a communication session with the computer network throughout, for example in lines 3-5 of the abstract.

Regarding claim **34**, Devillier does not expressly disclose the limitation of the database being associated with the computer. White discloses the limitation of the database being associated with the computer in lines 51-57 of column 14. This

passage indicates the association of the database with the computer (PC) through the Internet address fields. Devillier and White are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of call processing in telecommunications networks. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify Devillier to store call routing instructions in a database on the Internet. The motivation for doing so would have been to greater universality of custom subscriber services as suggested by White in lines 43-45 of column 6. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine White with Devillier for the benefit of greater universality of custom services to obtain the invention as specified in claim 31.

18. Claims **32 and 35** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,366,661 to Devillier et al in view of U.S. Patent 6,014,379 to White et al as applied to claim 31 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent 5,917,817 to Dunn et al.

Devillier, modified, discloses all the limitations of claim 31 as indicated in the rejection above. However, Devillier does not disclose expressly the limitation of the call routing instructions being maintained by the subscriber or the limitation of the database being accessible to the subscriber.

Dunn discloses throughout the document a method of allowing subscribers to access a database to modify the service provided to them. Specifically, the database is the customer feature database 18 of figures 5 and 6. The access is described in lines 41-60 of column 5. This access discloses the limitation that the database is accessible

to the subscriber and thus also discloses the limitation that the subscriber maintains the call routing instructions since modifications to this database affect how calls to that subscriber are handled. Devillier, modified, and Dunn are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of call processing in advanced intelligent networks. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify Devillier, modified, to allow subscribers to modify the contents of the Internet database. The motivation for doing so would have been to provide a cost-effective and simple method for enabling customers to control services at any time as suggested by Dunn in lines 66 of column 1 through line 5 of column 2. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Dunn with Devillier, modified, for the benefit of allowing subscribers to control services to obtain the invention as specified in claims 32 and 35.

19. Claim **36** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,366,661 to Devillier et al in view of U.S. Patent 6,014,379 to White et al as applied to claim 31 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent 6,144,644 to Bajzath et al.

Devillier, modified, discloses all the limitations of claim 31 as indicated in the rejection above. However, Devillier does not disclose expressly the limitation of activating the trigger when a communication session is established between the subscriber and the computer network.

Bajzath discloses (lines 41-67 of column 4) the limitation of the trigger (the first trigger in this case) being activated when a communication session is established between the computer and the computer network.

Devillier, modified, and Bajzath are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of call processing in advanced intelligent networks. These two references are in fact directed in part to the same problem the applicant is solving which is notification of incoming calls to users with an online connection (via that online connection).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify Devillier to trigger processing based on the dialing of the ISPs number and activate the TAT trigger based on this ISP number dialing.

The motivation for doing so would be to allow more flexibility by allowing the call waiting and call control method to be performed whether the user was connected to the Internet or to a non-Internet party as specified by Bajzath in the last sentence of the abstract and lines 1-7 of column 8.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Bajzath with Devillier for the benefit of providing a flexible network architecture to obtain the invention as specified in claim 36.

Conclusion

20. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

U.S. Patents 6,353,611, 5,805,587, 6,438,222, 5,809,128, 6,757,274, 6,693,897, 6,666,785, 6,178,183, 6,005,870, and 5,946,381, and U.S. Patent Application Publications 2003/0108172 and 2002/0097710 all disclose very similar solutions to the same problem the applicant is solving.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Robert C. Scheibel whose telephone number is 703-305-9062. The examiner can normally be reached on 6:30-3:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Seema S. Rao can be reached on 703-308-5463. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

RCS 7-7-04

Robert C. Scheibel
Examiner
Art Unit 2666

DANG TON
PRIMARY EXAMINER